

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date shown below.

Dated: 4/21/04 Signature: [Signature]
(Grace Yu)

Docket No.: 140942000201
Client No. DX0758K1-RE
(PATENT)



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Re Patent Application of:
J. Fernando BAZAN

Art Unit: 1646

Application No.: 09/935,366

Examiner: P. Mertz

Filed: August 22, 2001

EXPEDITED PROCEDURE –
EXAMINING GROUP 1646

For: DNA ENCODING INTERLEUKIN-B30

AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL ACTION (37 C.F.R. SECTION § 1.116)

MS AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This is in response to an Office action herein mailed March 25, 2004, the time for the two month early response to which is set to expire May 25, 2004. Accordingly, this response is timely filed. Careful consideration has been given to the grounds for rejection, and the following amendment and discussion are offered in response. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Also included herein is the following Exhibit:

Exhibit A: Substitute Declaration under 35 U.S.C. § 251.



COPY PAPERS
ORIGINALLY FILED



Attorney Docket No.: 15531-000486 NUS
Client Docket No.: DX0768K1 RB

PATENT

SEP 17 2002

RECEIVED
FBI CENTER 1600/2900

7/c
(NB)
DMT
9-18-02

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of J. Fernando Bazan

Application No.: 09/935,366

Filed: August 22, 2001

For: DNA ENCODING INTERLEUKIN-
B30

Examiner: Joseph F. Murphy, Ph.D.

Art Unit: 1646

Response to Office Action

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

This is in response to the "final" Office Action mailed June 12, 2002 in the above-captioned patent application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. A precautionary notice of appeal and the appropriate fees accompany this response.

Status of the Application

Claims 1-7, 9-10, and 12-17 are pending and stand rejected in the application. The claims remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112, first paragraph, as allegedly lacking utility. These rejections, the only outstanding issue in the subject application, are addressed below.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101 and 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st Paragraph

The instant Office Action maintained the rejection of the pending claims as allegedly lacking apparent or disclosed patentable utility. Applicant has previously pointed out that, contrary to the assertions of the Office, the subject specification has disclosed patentable